

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/815,251	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CHANG ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Tamra L. Dicus	<b>Art Unit</b> 1774	

**All Participants:**

(1) Tamra L. Dicus.

(2) Peter Brunoski.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 25 October 2005

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*Obvious Double Patenting rejection over USPN 6,897,168*

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*The Examiner pointed out that '168 claims substantially the same material while the word "triggerable" is not claimed. Applicant agreed to send in a Terminal Disclaimer to obviate an Obvious Double Patenting Rejection.*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)